

Remarks

Prior to this amendment, claims 1-44, 46-54, and 67-72 were pending in this application. Claim 46 is amended herein. Support for the amendment of claim 46 can be found in the specification at least at page 8, lines 3-5 and at page 11, lines 15-18. After entry of this amendment, **claims 1-44, 46-54, and 67-72 are pending in this application.**

No new matter has been added by these amendments. Unless specifically stated otherwise, none of these amendments are intended to limit the scope of any claim. Entry of this amendment is appropriate after final because it implements a suggestion of the Examiner and will not require further search or examination in order for the case to be allowed.

Withdrawal of Claim Rejections

Applicant thanks Examiner Sang for withdrawing the rejections of claims 10, 25, 44, 50, 68, and 69 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph in the current action. In addition, Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejection of claims 1-4, 10, 11, 14-18, 20, 21, 24-29, 32-42, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Applicant also thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the rejection of claims 1-44, 50, and 67-69 under U.S.C. §103(a). Finally, Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawal of the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-6, 8-21, 24, 32-37, 40-42, 44, 46-54, 67, and 69 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim Rejections Under U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 46-49, 51-54, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious with respect to Christian (EP 0 139 373 A1), in view of Imai (U.S. Patent No. 5,057,438), Okabe *et al.* (*J. Histochem. Cytochem.*, 41(6):927-934, 1993), Olsen *et al.* (*J. Immun.*, 220:77-84, 1998), Manabe *et al.*, (*Anal. Biochem.*, 143:39-45, 1984), Pappalardo *et al.*, (*Seminars in Radiation Oncology*, 8:217-223, 1998), and Huang *et al.* (*Anal. Biochem.*, 268:305-317, 1999). Applicant traverses this rejection. However, solely to advance prosecution in this case, claim 46 is amended to recite “wherein a two-dimensional architecture of the biological specimen is preserved throughout the transfer,” as suggested by the Examiner in the Office action. Claims 47-49, 51-54, and 71 depend, directly or indirectly, from

claim 46 and incorporate all the limitations thereof. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 46-49, 51-54, and 71 in light of the amendment of claim 46.

Conclusions

Based on the foregoing amendments and arguments, the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to this effect is requested. If for any reason the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite allowance of the claims, please telephone the undersigned at (503) 595-5300.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By /Anne Carlson/
Anne Carlson, Ph.D.
Registration No. 47,472